

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
MAG REGIONAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

September 21, 2009
MAG Offices, Cholla Room
302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Councilwoman Peggy Neely, Chair	Mayor James M. Cavanaugh, Goodyear
Mayor Thomas L. Schoaf, Litchfield Park, Vice Chair	Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa
Mayor Hugh Hallman, Tempe, Treasurer	Mayor Jim Lane, Scottsdale
Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale	

* Not present

Participated by video or telephone conference call

1. Call to Order

The Executive Committee meeting was called to order by Chair Peggy Neely at 12:09 p.m. Chair Neely stated that public comment cards were available for those members of the public who wish to comment. She noted that transit tickets were available from Valley Metro for those using transit to come to the meeting. Parking validation was available from MAG staff for those who parked in the parking garage.

2. Call to the Audience

Chair Neely noted that, according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out the public comment cards and stated that there is a three-minute time limit. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Chair Neely noted that no public comment cards had been received.

3. Consent Agenda

Chair Neely noted that prior to action on the consent agenda, members of the audience are provided an opportunity to comment on consent items that are being presented for action. Following the comment period, Committee members may request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. There were no public comment cards received.

Chair Neely requested approval of items on the consent agenda. She noted that there would be two separate motions. Chair Neely asked if there were any questions on item #3B. Chair Neely commented that she was glad to see cooperation between MAG staff and staff from the Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG).

Chair Neely requested a motion to approve item #3A. Mayor Lane moved to approve item #3A on the consent agenda. Mayor Schoaf seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Mayor Cavanaugh moved to approve item #3B on the consent agenda. Mayor Schoaf seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

3A. Approval of the August 18, 2009 Regional Council Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

The Regional Council Executive Committee, by consent, approved the August 18, 2009, Regional Council Executive Committee meeting minutes.

3B. Vendor Selection for Aerial Photography

The Regional Council Executive Committee, by consent, approved to select Aerials Express to provide digital aerial photography in an amount of \$71,500, with MAG responsible for \$25,000 and CAAG responsible for \$46,500.

In May 2009, the MAG Regional Council approved the FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, which included \$40,000 for digital aerial photography for use in planning activities by both MAG and its member agencies. This imagery is purchased on an annual basis and typically includes substantial portions of Pinal County. This year MAG staff was approached by the Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG) staff to enter into a partnership to issue a single Invitation for Bids. MAG and CAAG would both receive the full imagery acquisition, and CAAG's payment responsibility would be for the Pinal County portion of the imagery. As in past years, this photography will be made available at no charge to MAG member agencies, as well as to CAAG member agencies. On July 22, 2009, the MAG Regional Council approved amending the FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget for MAG to accept funds from the Central Arizona Association of Governments for the Pinal County portion of the digital aerial photography. MAG issued the Invitation for Bids on July 24, 2009 and received two bids to provide this product, from Aerials Express and Landiscor Aerial Information. A multi jurisdictional evaluation team reviewed the bids, and unanimously recommended to MAG that the bid from Aerials Express be selected. On September 16, 2009, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of this item.

4. MAG Committee Chair and Vice Chair Appointments

Chair Neely noted that a handout regarding chair and vice chair appointments had been provided. She invited Mayor Cavanaugh to provide further comments.

Mayor Cavanaugh suggested that the Executive Committee vote on the slate identified on the handout provided and to remove the Continuum of Care vice chair at this time noting that the cities could discuss this over the next few weeks. Mayor Cavanaugh moved to approve the MAG Committee chair and vice chair appointments as reflected on the slate provided except the Continuum of Care vice chair appointment. Mayor Hallman seconded the motion noting that a vote would take place next month on the Continuum of Care vice chair and the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

5. Funding for Marketing and Advertising Provided to RPTA for the Regional Rideshare, Telework and Ozone Outreach and Trip Reduction Programs

Chair Neely introduced Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director to make a presentation on item #5.

Mr. Smith noted that in September 2008, the Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA) issued a memorandum clarifying that no Public Transit Funds (PTF) or sales tax funds would be used to market new riders. He stated that at that time budget cuts were occurring in many agencies and that bus service was also being impacted. Mr. Smith said that the RPTA brought this to MAG's attention and MAG staff met with RPTA staff to ask about their expenditure of advertising and marketing money provided by MAG. He stated that at that time a decision was made not to come to the Executive Committee to request a modification, but that MAG staff would continue to monitor the RPTA expenditures in these areas. Mr. Smith noted that MAG had analyzed what was being paid for throughout year using the funds provided by MAG. He stated that the memorandum provided was developed to answer some of staff's questions. Mr. Smith said that MAG staff was uneasy about some of the expenditures which had been made in light of the atmosphere that was in place and has remained regarding the reduction of agency budgets. He added that in addition to reviewing the use of MAG's federal funds in marketing and advertising, staff had requested what was being spent collectively on these programs. Mr. Smith noted that a chart provided in the memorandum identified that \$4.2 million dollars is being spent annually on marketing and advertising. He added that the \$4.2 million includes approximately \$1 million from Maricopa County for the Clean Air Campaign, \$1 million from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) for the Trip Reduction program and \$2 million from MAG for Rideshare, Telework Ozone and Trip Reduction. Mr. Smith said he wanted to clarify that the decision before the Executive Committee was not whether the programs were needed because they were required by federal and state law. He said rather what level of federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds should be used for marketing, advertising, trip reduction, rideshare and air quality education efforts. He said that after researching several metropolitan areas, staff had developed four options for consideration which included: Option 1 - no change and keep the \$429,215 for marketing and advertising; Option 2 - RPTA keeps \$429,215 but just for marketing and there is no paid advertising; Option 3 - redirect the \$429,215 out of marketing and advertising budget and give it to RPTA staff to visit employers under the trip reduction ordinance; and Option 4 - eliminate the \$429,215 from the RPTA budget. Mr. Smith added that it was evident that the staff members at the RPTA believed in these programs and that they have done great job. He noted that the issue was not the employees, but whether at what level the programs were needed. Mr. Smith stated that with the contracts for the RPTA due on October 1, MAG staff believed it was the appropriate time to receive guidance from the Executive Committee on what should be implemented moving forward. Mr. Smith invited Lindy Bauer, MAG Environmental Director and Julie Hoffman, MAG Environmental Planning Program Manager to provide further comments. He thanked Ms. Bauer and Ms. Hoffman for their hard work researching this issue.

Chair Neely stated that David Boggs, RPTA Executive Director had requested to speak following staff's presentation and before a motion would be made. She noted that the Executive Committee would be able to have further dialogue following Mr. Boggs' comments.

Ms. Bauer stated that staff was there to answer any questions members of the Executive Committee may have had from the material provided.

Mayor Smith said he was confused. He noted that Mesa has had several presentations from various groups on the issue of air quality. Mayor Smith asked if the programs overlapped or whether there was any duplication of efforts between the various groups who were providing advertising on air quality. He said he was not sure exactly what was out there and that it seemed like there were many entities advertising or marketing air quality. Mayor Smith asked how those efforts related with the program being presently discussed.

Mr. Smith replied that Maricopa County was required to have a clean air campaign. He added that in the past, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) provided funding to Maricopa County and that Maricopa County provided funding to the RPTA to run a clean air campaign. Mr. Smith noted that the RPTA had done a great job with its program. He stated that in the last three years, due to PM 10 concerns, Maricopa County initiated its own clean air campaign and has used approximately \$1 million of its own funds leading to the existence of two clean air campaigns in the Valley and two awards programs. He added that including Valley Forward, which is not publicly funded, there was a total of three clean air campaigns.

Chair Neely asked whether the air quality program with the County was required as part of their air quality plan.

Ms. Bauer responded yes and that it was a part of the County's commitment made for the PM 10 five percent plan.

Mayor Smith asked whether there was any cross utilization or coordination in the efforts or whether the programs operated independently.

Mr. Smith replied that MAG staff met with staff from Maricopa County regarding concerns MAG had regarding the air quality program. He noted that a subsequent item on the Executive Committee's agenda concerned trip reduction and rideshare. Mr. Smith stated that he was glad that this issue was being addressed and that in his discussions with staff from Maricopa County it was noted that there may be duplication and a need to combine efforts.

Chair Neely asked if there were further questions.

Mayor Hallman said that it appeared to be two elements being discussed. He stated that presently the Executive Committee was addressing the marketing and advertising element. Mayor Hallman added that in addition to MAG's contribution to air quality campaign efforts, there was indication that there had been a lot of duplication of marketing and advertising of various programs and that it was not clear that the marketing and advertising had been coordinated to the extent that the community was aware of the programs being offered by the various agencies. Mayor Hallman stated that the marketing and advertising effort needed to be coordinated, but that the underlying programs also needed to be managed better. He asked how difficult it would be and how much time it would take to get the agencies involved together to identify programs and how to run them as efficiently and effectively as possible and then market and advertise those programs more holistically.

Mr. Smith replied that during the sweeps by the state legislature, MAG had hosted a meeting with Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) to discuss the potential effect of budget cuts on the programs. He added that the three agencies had worked out a plan to keep the programs afloat. Mr. Smith said that MAG could call on the agencies to meet with the RPTA to discuss how to have a better integrated campaign or program. He added that it could be possible to keep stand alone programs. Mr. Smith said that MAG has had its own difficulties with silos because of how the MAG process worked which was driven at the technical committee level. He noted that when individuals begin looking for funding they go to the technical committees, but that the process was faulty and did not foster the coordination needed to happen between programs. Mr. Smith said that MAG could coordinate a meeting with the funding partners to see if there was a better way to address the issue and get some efficiency and cost savings which he believed was the ultimate goal.

Mayor Hallman stated that it was either to reduce the cost or improve the delivery of the programs.

Mr. Smith agreed and that for example it could lead to possibly one awards program.

Chair Neely agreed with Mayor Hallman. She said that she thought a meeting to discuss better coordination of the programs among the various agencies was an excellent idea. Chair Neely said that MAG could be a partner at the table looking at the money being expended, but that it was better to bring the other partners together and look at what will be done holistically with the funding received and come up with a unified program. She asked if there were any other comments.

Mayor Lane said that Option 2 noted that other than in first year, there were no paid media expenditures. He asked if there were any savings or if it was just another hole.

Mr. Smith responded that MAG has had great cooperation with the RPTA, but that area was confusing for staff to understand. He stated that the RPTA has utilized R&R Partners to develop the program and the creativity for their programs. Mr. Smith said that the funding was only the paid advertising and that the RPTA needed the rest of the funding to go to R&R Partners to further develop the programs. He noted that the RPTA felt the programs would no longer be able to be provided if they did not have the remainder of the money with R&R Partners. Mr. Smith said that he had been told that if MAG provided the \$429,215 directly to the RPTA, they would not have the flexibility to hire the staff to do the programs. He noted that MAG used its own staff not consultants for managing special programs, but that the RPTA has stated that they did not have enough staff and could not manage them if they did not have the assistance of R&R Partners.

Mayor Lane stated that it was not a savings, but strictly an allocation to another area.

Chair Neely asked if there were any other comments. She asked if the Executive Committee had any objections to Mr. Boggs addressing the committee.

There were none.

Mr. Boggs said that Mr. Smith was correct and that the RPTA had coordinated with the previously mentioned agencies. He agreed that at some point getting everyone together in a room to discuss what has been done would be extremely helpful. Mr. Boggs said that the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) had recently evaluated transportation demand programs and identified RPTA's successes and how its program was nationally significantly lower with respect to costs. He said that eliminating the complete \$429, 215 and programs that have been in the Valley for twenty-three (23) years would affect some of the member cities RPTA did have. Mr. Boggs said that if there was a better way to do that and the Executive Committee would like the agency to return and report where the funding would be spent, with the exception of salaries, he would be happy to work with MAG rather than have the funding completely eliminated. He said that would have an impact on the organization and he would be happy to work with whatever process the Executive Committee identified.

Chair Neely asked if members of the Executive Committee had any questions of Mr. Boggs.

Mayor Hallman said he was not sure whether his impression was correct, but that it appeared that there were two separate agencies operating programs and four agencies funding them. He added that the two operating programs seemed to include the efforts by Maricopa County and the RPTA. Mayor Hallman continued that the funding for those initiatives was being provided by Maricopa County, ADEQ, RPTA and MAG. He asked how the funding differed for marketing and advertising versus actual operations.

Mr. Boggs replied that his staff could answer that question, but he wanted to clarify that some of the programs being discussed were rideshare related. He noted that other agencies did not work on those programs, but the RPTA did provide those services.

Mayor Hallman said that looking under Clean Air Programs there were some strict marketing programs, but there were also specific efforts like rideshare. He noted that Valley Metro Rail (METRO) operated a lot of advertising in the same regard to persuade the public to use the rail system versus driving a car. Mayor Hallman said he suspected that there were marketing dollars over at METRO that were probably not as well coordinated as they might be with the RPTA. He said that it struck him that there were four agencies currently funding programs and at least three agencies, including Valley Forward, operating clean air programs.

Mr. Boggs introduced Tony Bowman, Manager of Transportation Demand Management, from the RPTA to discuss the programs being discussed which were not managed by other agencies.

Mr. Bowman said that there was overlap in certain programs, but that the RPTA was solely responsible for the Regional Rideshare and Trip Reduction programs as well as the outreach to businesses Valleywide which focused on congestion mitigation.

Mayor Hallman said that those responsibilities dated to the 1990 devolution of the authority from MAG to outsource those to the RPTA.

Mr. Bowman agreed. He said that the RPTA was solely responsible for congestion mitigation messages working through either the general public or through trip reduction programs with individual employers.

Mayor Hallman said that Mr. Bowman's response illustrated the silo feature about what was being discussed. He said that this was what the \$429,215 would impact and that in his view the issue was much larger. Mayor Hallman stated that MAG was spending the \$429,215 along with funds from other agencies on clean air program marketing and advertising that has not been coordinated so that more value would be leveraged from those dollars. He said that the funding that was being discussed was a good example to demonstrate this problem. Mayor Hallman said that this might be the moment to get all the agencies together and have everyone discuss what the programs were and how they could be cross marketed so more value could be leveraged. He said that either more or less money could be placed into marketing and advertising or a better job could be done in outreach. Mayor Hallman said he would support something like that at this level.

Mr. Boggs said that the RPTA would absolutely support that direction to put a hold on the \$429,215. He cautioned that salaries were also included and that the agency did have people working in those programs, but that other expenses could be held until such time the RPTA returned to the committee after working things out with the other agencies.

Mayor Hallman asked Mr. Boggs if he would object if the Executive Committee held the funding in abeyance pending a meeting of the agencies. He continued that he would be inclined to make a motion to have the \$429,215 withheld for current purposes pending a joint summit of the parties involved in the clean air programs. Mayor Hallman requested that another presentation be made to the Executive Committee and that Mr. Boggs had an opportunity to figure how move some of RPTA's own money to make sure salaries were paid.

Mr. Boggs said that RPTA could do that, but that he hoped that the funding would not be held up too long because there were some programs ready to go. He said that RPTA staff would be willing to return to the committee and work openly and responsibly with Mr. Smith and the other agencies. Mr. Boggs said that if all could work together on an agreement which worked for the Valley the agency would be very happy to do that.

Mayor Hallman said that the Executive Committee would not force any other agency to participate, but could only give direction to MAG staff. He said that he was inclined to suggest that METRO also be included as one of the other partners involved in the meeting to discuss marketing, advertising, and transit usage which he said ultimately reduced congestion and pollution and fell under clean air programs.

Chair Neely said that she agreed with Mayor Hallman. She commented that she did not see personnel costs referred to being impacted when she read Mr. Boggs memorandum.

Mr. Boggs said that the agency was hoping to have an action approved to address the issue but had not assumed that it would be Option 4. He said that since there were people who were working on the programs who would be affected, he will have to figure out how those salaries are paid for on a temporary basis.

Chair Neely asked whether the RPTA received other funding that could be applied to the programs.

Mr. Boggs replied that the agency did and would be trying to budget the funding temporarily until the issue is resolved, but that there was a greater issue to be addressed by all the agencies.

Chair Neely agreed. She said that she wanted MAG to be an equal partner at the table and that MAG's funding contribution should be leveraged toward a consolidated effort.

Mr. Smith said that the \$429,215 funding included direct expenses and that there was no labor included. He encouraged that staff return quickly to help identify the parameters of the program for the next fiscal year.

Chair Neely asked Ms. Bauer what would be a reasonable time frame for staff to return to the Executive Committee.

Ms. Bauer replied that she believed staff could return quickly and meet with the agencies in one to two months.

Chair Neely asked Mayor Hallman if he was ready to make a formal motion.

Mayor Hallman moved to hold the \$429,215 in abeyance pending a summit of the representatives of the RPTA, MAG, Maricopa County, METRO and ADEQ to discuss clean air programs and how they might be better coordinated from an operations perspective and better marketed in a coordinated effort.

Mr. Smith said that Mayor Hallman may want to consider including capitol rideshare because MAG has also provided funding to that program.

Mayor Hallman requested to also include examining capitol rideshare.

Chair Neely asked if there was any further discussion.

Mayor Schoaf said that it would be helpful if in the subsequent report a chart could be included that identified all the programs, the agencies that contributed funding to each of the programs, and a complete explanation of what MAG's funding was being used for operations or marketing. He said that it became increasingly confusing when programs were completely eliminated because it included making changes to a marketing budget. Mayor Schoaf added that it was important to understand where MAG's money was going as well.

Mayor Smith said he tended to agree with Mayor Hallman. He said that he was trying to figure out what the next step will be and whether when staff returned what the different options might include.

Mr. Smith said that staff could return with an agreement that combined the two clean air campaigns.

Mayor Smith asked what the total budget was for the clean air campaigns managed by the two agencies.

Mr. Smith responded that the funding included a little over \$1 million from Maricopa County. He asked Ms. Bauer how much funding came from MAG.

Ms. Bauer said MAG's contribution of \$429,215 plus \$ 1 million was approximately \$1.5 million.

Mayor Smith asked what would be the next step if the agencies did not want anything to change.

Mr. Smith said that MAG staff would feel more comfortable if the ideas that the RPTA had for expenditure of the funds in a general context came back to the Executive Committee in a work plan.

Mayor Smith said that it appeared MAG staff was looking for a refinement and that upon returning to the Executive Committee for further direction there will have been some buy in from the other agencies on a more coordinated plan.

Mr. Smith said yes.

Chair Neely said that she hoped that MAG would not just be turning over the full \$429,215 without the RPTA submitting their programs for independent review. She encouraged looking at other options that could exist which could include further partnering with Maricopa County. Chair Neely said that if a resolution with all the agencies could not be agreed upon, MAG may need to make a decision on how its funding would be utilized.

Mayor Smith said that he hoped that the Executive Committee would be able to receive a plan of action that could be implemented.

Mr. Smith said that another issue to consider was how to keep this from happening again. He said that the Executive Committee was primarily responsible for the MAG work program which will be coming to the committee for consideration in the spring. Mr. Smith noted that the way the work program is currently organized is in silos and there is no coordination with related programs.

Mayor Hallman said that this could be an opportunity where some real programmatic changes could be made to effect results for residents. He said that most people did not really care who was the source of the rideshare program as much as whether it was effective. Mayor Hallman moved to hold the \$429,215 in abeyance pending a regional summit of the five agencies if available, including MAG, RPTA, METRO, ADEQ and Maricopa County and to examine coordinating marketing and advertising as well as programmatic coordination for the clean air programs operated on behalf each of the agencies for our residents and include the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA) capital rideshare and all operating resources.

Chair Neely requested Mayor Hallman to add to the motion what would happen if there was failure to reach a compromise from that meeting.

Mayor Hallman added that if there was a failure to reach a compromise on programmatic and marketing and advertising efforts, the RPTA would present specific programmatic options to the MAG Executive Committee for approval on an individual basis. Mayor Lane seconded the motion.

Chair Neely asked if there was further discussion on the motion.

Mayor Lopez Rogers asked whether the outcomes from the marketing and advertising had been effective and if they had that included in their work plan.

Mayor Hallman confirmed if Mayor Lopez Rogers meant whether there were key measures for performance.

Mayor Lopez Rogers said yes.

Mayor Hallman asked if that required a friendly amendment.

Chair Neely asked whether it would be sufficient to reflect Mayor Lopez Rogers comment and clarify it in the minutes.

Mayor Lopez Rogers said that reflection in the minutes would be sufficient.

Chair Neely said that she was concerned about this issue on many fronts. She wanted to note, however, that the legislature could look to sweep other programs and that if they read the report and saw all the different funding sources available, she would be surprised if there would not be some changes to be considered. Chair Neely said it was important to make sure that the agencies demonstrated that the funding has been maximized and are providing a solid program. She said that she believed that Mr. Boggs and the RPTA has done so, but that a more unified program was needed. Chair Neely said that she believed the Executive Committee was trying to be more regional and she was hopeful that good results would be accomplished. She said that she wanted to see MAG staff participating in the process from this point forward.

Chair Neely thanked Mr. Boggs for his participation and attendance. She noted that a second to the motion had been made and asked if there was any other discussion. There was none and the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

6. Transportation Regional Planning Roles and Responsibilities Update

Chair Neely invited Mr. Smith and Mr. Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director to present an update on transportation regional planning roles and responsibilities.

Mr. Smith said that a multicolored chart had been included as supporting material to this item. He noted that the chart had been presented previously and that it had been utilized by the interagency planning group to assist staff in developing a recommendation. Mr. Smith stated that the Intermodal Planning Group, including representatives from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) met at MAG on April 17, 2009. He said that this group visited MAG each year to review the work program and that he was asked a question by the FTA representative to explain the transit programming process in the MAG region. Mr. Smith stated that the process used by MAG had been implemented for several years and included recommendations made by the RPTA on transit projects which were brought through MAG's Transportation Review Committee (TRC), Management Committee and ultimately the Regional Council. He noted that the FTA representative indicated that the

process was unacceptable because MAG as a metropolitan planning organization needed to be responsible for programming and planning. Mr. Smith added that MAG could not delegate that responsibility to the RPTA. He said that since that meeting, there had been correspondence sent to the MAG office because different staff members from different agencies have asked questions. Mr. Smith noted that the FTA representative has made it very clear that MAG needed to update its Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the transit operators and clearly define the transit programming process and that the programming needed to be at MAG. He said that MAG basically had a conditional approval for the transit projects and that the transit projects would go forward in anticipation that at the November meeting, there would be clarification of MAG's planning process and the MOU will have been changed to clearly articulate that MAG was primarily responsible for transit programming. Mr. Smith said that in discussions with the other transit agencies, there was consensus on Option 1 for the programming to come to MAG, but that after Option 1 there did not appear to be a lot of consensus. He noted that MAG staff was recommending that if the programming came to MAG, it would be necessary to have a Transit Committee that reported to the TRC. Mr. Smith said some have indicated why not just have transit be the responsibility of the TRC to avoid creating another MAG committee. He stated that as a result transit would not have much advocacy and that without a committee at MAG, there would be a committee from the RPTA recommending projects to MAG which would not solve the issue. Mr. Smith invited Mr. Anderson to discuss the performance audit, the transit peer review panel, visit from the Transportation Review Board, and what has occurred on the transportation programming and planning areas which has made explaining the process to the public in the region more difficult.

Mr. Anderson recalled that MAG hosted a visit last fall by a consultant working on a Transportation Research Board study on metropolitan planning organizations and transit agencies, including their relevant roles and responsibilities. He said that MAG also had conducted a transit peer review panel which included representatives from Seattle, Denver, Salt Lake City, Dallas, Atlanta, and San Diego. Mr. Anderson noted that each of the representatives on the transit peer review panel thought that the key to good transit planning was that transit be integrated with all the other modes of transportation. Mr. Anderson added that MAG had another peer review panel on the Central Phoenix freeway program. He said that although the project initially began looking at the freeway components in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), it identified how MAG could refine those projects to make them better for the central area's mobility. Mr. Anderson said that a recommendation coming from that panel clearly emphasized that MAG needed to do a better job in integrated planning, which included a number of examples on the I-10 West corridor. He noted that in particular there were opportunities for good integrated planning in terms of where stations were located, park and ride facilities interfaced with commuter rail, and bus rapid transit. Mr. Anderson said that the last factor MAG needed to consider was the pending performance audit on the Proposition 400 program which would be starting right after the first of the year. He said that the audit was a statutory mandated performance audit on Proposition 400 that occurred every five years and patterned from the performance audits of the freeway program which first occurred in 1991 by KPMG. Mr. Anderson said that KPMG developed approximately seventy (70) recommendations on how the Proposition 300 freeway program could be managed more efficiently and effectively. He said that one of major findings sorted out roles and responsibilities in terms of setting freeway priorities, oversight of overall program and that many of those recommendations had been incorporated into state statute

in 1992. Mr. Anderson summarized the four options included on the multicolored chart: He said that Option 1 included the programming function which corresponded with the development of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and would remain solely within MAG. Mr. Anderson noted that MAG would work cooperatively with Phoenix, as the designated recipient, and the other transit operators in the region on transit projects similar to MAG's process with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) as it pertained to the freeway program. He noted that although MAG prioritized freeway projects, MAG works in cooperation with ADOT as the owner and operator of the freeway program system. Mr. Anderson said that Option 2 included planning and in particular the long range planning and transit investments needed in the region, such as the overall system plan, the transit framework study, sub area and corridor specific projects, transit circulator studies, and park and ride locations studies. He noted that Option 3 referred to project development which included the preparation of the required studies for the transit projects such as Environmental Impact Statements, Environmental Assessments, Project Scoping, and Development of Design Concept reports and the required alternatives analysis for the New Start and Small Start Program. He said that under this scenario follow up on the project development, which would include preliminary engineering, final design and actual construction would still be handled by the implementing agencies, much like ADOT handles the engineering, design, and construction activities on the freeway program. Lastly, Mr. Anderson identified that Option 4 included the incorporation of many of the activities discussed such as transportation demand management activities including Rideshare, Telework and Bike Education and safety oriented programs. He noted that MAG had both a Safety Committee and Safety Program and that Option 4 included the incorporation of those activities into the MAG organization. Mr. Anderson offered to answer any questions.

Mayor Schoaf asked what was the minimum action MAG needed to take to get through the audits without causing further problems for federal representatives.

Mr. Anderson responded that the minimum changes that needed to be made was to address the programming which would be Option 1. He noted that the programming issue had been raised by both the Intermodal Planning Group Certification as well as the directly from the FTA representative.

Mayor Schoaf said that it appeared as one moved across the options on the multicolored chart that there were only two real color changes in the first option and they came under the second and the fourth item under programming. He said that proceeding to Option 2 there was a change in the fourth program piece but that other than that the remaining elements in programming were not changing in the first two options.

Mr. Anderson responded that Mayor Schoaf was correct.

Mayor Cavanaugh said that when responsibilities among organizations became consolidated this almost always results in a diminishing role for one or more of the organizations, which eventually could lead to the possibility of eliminating one of them. He said he could presently agree with Option 1 and to proceed moving quickly to the other options made sense. Mayor Cavanaugh said that Mr. Smith indicated there was a lot of information still needed such as the costs and savings associated with each option. He said that before proceeding to the other options, it would be important to know that information. Mayor Cavanaugh noted that he was concerned about the support roles and what that included. He

asked why the organizations that were losing responsibilities continuing to have a support role because that included positions and the costs of doing business which should be reduced.

Mr. Anderson said that in follow up to Mayor Schoaf's comments, MAG had spent a lot of time on Option 1 and less time discussing Options 2, 3 and 4. He said that some of the support activities may become combined as the agencies further discuss the issue. Mr. Anderson agreed with Mayor Cavanaugh that some support activities could be consolidated even further. He noted that some things like FTA policy and regulations involved system operations as opposed to system planning work. Mr. Anderson said that an operating entity like the RPTA needed to have somebody keep track of those things from a policy perspective unless everything was consolidated into one agency. He stated that some of the support activities could be further refined and that staff could bring that back to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Smith said that the challenge was how far to go on the options before the performance audit. He said that if the performance audit was going to be shortly after the first of the year, the goal should be to sort the activities as much as possible. Mr. Smith stated that he had always viewed the RPTA as an operating agency and METRO as an operating agency like ADOT and that MAG was the planning agency. He said that where there was confusion and overlap in those roles, the agencies should discuss the issue in a reasonable way to eliminate the overlap or the performance audit was going to identify it and the legislature will become aware of this potentially taking the control away from the agencies.

Mayor Smith said that it was obvious something needed to be done and that now seemed like the perfect time for a number of reasons to do something. He said that the transit and transportation systems had evolved to the point with Proposition 400. He said that during Proposition 300 the region was thinking differently and that now the mindset of the region was different. Mayor Smith stated that one thing the economic downturn had impacted was that all MAG member cities at different levels were looking at new, efficient, and better ways to do things. He noted that they were restructuring and with the new mind set made it a perfect time to move in a new direction. Mayor Smith moved to approve Option 1, form a MAG transit committee, address the potential budget issues regarding the RPTA and METRO in the development of the FY 2011 MAG Unified Planning and Work Program and Annual Budget and MAG staff returns to the Executive Committee in three months to report on the progress of the transition process. Mayor Hallman seconded the motion.

Chair Neely clarified that the Executive Committee wanted to approve Option 1 but to continue moving through the process to identify a resolution by May of the following year for final resolution of transportation regional planning roles and responsibilities.

Mayor Smith said he assumed that there would be a natural progression and that in three months the Executive Committee could discuss issues pertaining to the budget. He said that there were a lot of questions that had yet to be answered but could not answered until further details were provided. He said that the necessary adjustments could be made in three months.

Mayor Schoaf asked Mayor Smith if it was his intention that staff be responsible for returning to the Executive Committee with a plan to move the process forward or that it may occur as part of the natural progression of activities.

Mayor Smith responded that staff needed to come back with a plan to the Executive Committee proposing how things would progress and know as early as possible what the budget ramifications were. He said that one of the big discussions at the last Executive Committee meeting on this item was how this might affect positions and whether there was going to be cross utilization in staffing. Mayor Smith said he assumed that within the first 90 days staff would come back with a report and a plan as to how to move forward.

Mayor Schoaf said that the Executive Committee wanted to be very clear that it will be a staff responsibility to bring back an analysis of going from Option 1 to Option 4. He added that if the recommendation did not include going all the way to Option 4, why not and what the time frame for that might be.

Mayor Smith said he hoped to get an updated report and that the Executive Committee could look at the progress that had been made and know the direction the organization was heading.

Mayor Hallman proposed adding a friendly amendment stipulating 90 days or less. He said that although the chart identified only planning functions, there should be another chart discussing operations and how that could be combined, save money, and make the systems work more efficiently.

Mayor Smith accepted Mayor Hallman's friendly amendment to stipulate 90 days or less.

Mayor Hallman asked if it also was Mayor Smith intention to also include looking at Options 2,3, and 4 including examining how these operations might be combined in a way to benefit residents.

Mayor Smith said that it was his intention to concentrate on the planning. He said that his motion anticipated concentrating on the planning since that appeared to be the most pressing issue and the direction with which MAG was required to comply. Mayor Smith said that he hoped consolidation was also a part of the process and that it certainly was the elephant in the room. He said that he believed it will be a natural progression and that as planning is further discussed, other areas will come up and things will become more apparent.

Chair Neely said that with respect to the cost savings and budgetary issues, it will be a natural progression, but that his motion did not currently state that. She said that she appreciated adding that in 90 days or sooner the Executive Committee would have a report. Chair Neely requested that the item remain on the agenda every month.

Mayor Smith agreed that using 90 days would be fine, but that he hoped it would be possible to get something tangible prior to that.

Mayor Lopez Rogers said that before supporting the formation of a transit committee, she needed further clarification regarding its function and where membership of the committee would come from.

Mr. Smith said that MAG currently had some transit functions that were not under a committee. He said that the Commuter Rail stakeholders group would be an example of that. Mr. Smith said that the transit committee would also discuss commuter rail, park and ride

lots, and bus projects. He added that as with all MAG committees, membership on the transit committee would be open to every MAG member agency to participate.

Mayor Lane said he certainly supported 90 days or less and also the idea of the natural progression that was identified on the handout. He said that the chart depicted only the planning, but that he was also in agreement with Mayor Hallman with regard to the next step which would be the consolidation of operations. Mayor Lane said what was currently being considered as he understood it with the friendly amendment was how MAG moved forward and would incorporate the information the Executive Committee will be receiving in the in the future.

Mayor Hallman said that he did not mean to imply that Mayor Smith's motion was broader than it legally could be. He said he wanted to get a better understanding in public about whether or not there was a consensus to begin looking at operations in a way to deliver services most cost effectively and efficiently.

Chair Neely said that if the Executive Committee made progress on an incremental level and looked at the budget, the other issues will most likely be discussed.

Mayor Lopez Rogers asked if this process would also go through the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC).

Mr. Smith responded that with respect to the work program the process would go to the Executive Committee and the Regional Council.

Mayor Lopez Rogers asked about the Transit Committee.

Mr. Smith said that the process pertaining to the Transit Committee would be equivalent to the Street Committee which included reporting to the TRC and the TPC.

Chair Neely requested Mayor Smith to repeat the motion.

Mayor Smith moved to accept staff's recommendation to begin transit programming consolidation by approving Option 1, forming a MAG transit committee, address the potential budget issues regarding the RPTA and METRO in the development of the FY 2011 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, and direct MAG staff to report back to the Executive Committee in three months or less on the progress of the transition. Mayor Hallman seconded the motion.

Chair Neely asked if there was further discussion.

Mayor Cavanaugh asked if the motion included the analysis of the cost effectiveness of the options.

Mayor Smith said he thought that was included with respect to the development of the budget and that by including METRO and the RPTA it would address all the budget ramifications that needed to be addressed.

Chair Neely asked if there were other comments. There were none and the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

7. Assistance to the Maricopa County Air Quality Department for Air Quality Monitors

Chair Neely introduced Ms. Bauer to provide a presentation on this item.

Mayor Hallman stated that the item appeared self explanatory and that he did not believe it was necessary to spend too much time on a presentation.

Chair Neely requested a motion on item #7.

Mayor Hallman moved to amend the FY 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to include a project to provide the Maricopa County Air Quality Department \$98,552.46 to purchase and install three continuous air quality monitors. Mayor Cavanaugh seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

8. Request for Future Items

Chair Neely asked if there were any requests for future agenda items.

Mayor Lane noted that a request had been made to include a monthly update on the transportation regional roles and responsibilities and it likely fell under this request.

Chair Neely said Mayor Lane was correct and said if the item could be placed on the agenda it would be very helpful.

_____ Chair Neely asked if there were any other requests. There were none.

9. Adjournment

Mayor Schoaf moved to adjourn the Executive Committee meeting. Mayor Lane seconded the motion and it carried unanimously (7-0). There being no further business, the Executive Committee adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Chair

Secretary